

Serial No. 09/753,345

- 5 -

Art Unit: 2697

Claim 19 (original) An apparatus according to claim 17, wherein the first message feed comprises one of a voice mail, fax mail, email, and an information source, and the second message feed comprises a different one of the voice mail, fax mail, email, and the information source.

Claim 20 (original) An apparatus according to claim 17, wherein the communication system further includes a PBX coupled to a plurality of office phones associated with the certain users, one of the first and second message feeds being voice mail associated with the office phones.

REMARKS

Reconsideration and further examination is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner has rejected claims 5 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as reciting non-statutory subject matter due to the use of the term WAP in the claims. While Applicant's would disagree that the term WAP is 'not well-known keyword', they have nevertheless amended the claim to spell out the acronym of Wireless Access Protocol (WAP). Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4, 6-12 and 14-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Smith et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,333,973). Claims 5 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Smith et al. in view of Gustafsson (US patent 6,424,841). Claim 20 was rejected over Smith in view of Matthews.

AMN120.058

Serial No. 09/753,345

- 6 -

Art Unit: 2697

Statement of Common Ownership

Smith was filed on April 23, 1997, and issued on December 25, 2001 to the same owner as the present application. The present application was filed on December 29, 2000, and therefore is referred to as a PG-PUB application.

According to the MPEP, When examining applications filed on or after November 29, 2000 or applications filed prior to November 29, 2000 which have been voluntarily published (PG-PUB applications), for 35 U.S.C. 102(e) to apply:

(A) The reference must be a U.S. patent (or SIR), a U.S. patent application publication, or an international application publication with a filing date earlier than the effective filing date of the application being examined. ... **and**

(B) The inventive entity of the application must be different than that of the reference.

In the present case, since the inventive entity of both applications is the same, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103 (both of which rely on the Smith reference) are improper, and should be withdrawn.

AMN120.058

Serial No. 09/753,345

- 7 -

Art Unit: 2697

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Lindsay McGuinness, Applicants' Attorney at so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

3/4/2003
Date

Lindsay McGuinness
Lindsay McGuinness, Reg. No. 38,549
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Steubing McGuinness & Manaras LLP
30 Nagog Park Drive
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-6664

Docket No. 061473/0269982 120-058
dd: 2/6/03

AMN120.058